

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/790,110	03/02/2004	Takeshi Ueno	249432US2SRD DIV	2904		
22850 7590 08/13/2004 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			EXAMINER CHOE, HENRY			
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		-,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2817			
				DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1M			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/790,110	UENO ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Henry K Choe	2817				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	rith the correspondence addre	ss			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by steply received by the Office later than three months after the red patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thi eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commi BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	16 July 2004.					
•	•	This action is non-final.					
3)	, '						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)🛛	Claim(s) 23-37 is/are pending in the applic	ation.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-26</u> is/are rejected.						
7)🖂	Claim(s) <u>27-37</u> is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.					
Applicat	on Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.	•				
•	D) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	orrection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	i.121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by th						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in a priority documents have beer ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Sta	ge			
Attachmen	• •	Λ Π 1-4- · ·	Summany (DTO, 442)				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔯 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Slar No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/2004.	, – –	Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	2)			

Art Unit: 2817

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 23-26 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 123456. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current (child case) claim limitations are merely broader recitations of the parent case recitations.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 27-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2817

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Choe whose telephone number is (571) 272-1760.

HENRY CHOE PRIMARY EXAMINER

#888